



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/575,786

04/14/2006

Akitoshi Kuno

2006_0530A

4651

52349

7590

11/24/2010

WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK L.L.P.

1030 15th Street, N.W.

Suite 400 East

Washington, DC 20005-1503

EXAMINER

HARVEY, DAVID E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2621

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/24/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com

coa@wenderoth.com

Response to Rule 312 Communication	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/575,786	KUNO, AKITOSHI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	DAVID E. HARVEY	2481

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

1. ☒ The amendment filed on 10 November 2010 under 37 CFR 1.312 has been considered, and has been:

a) ☐ entered.

b) ☒ entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention.

c) ☐ disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee.

Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(1) and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue.

d) ☐ disapproved. See explanation below.

e) ☐ entered in part. See explanation below.

1) The change to the title set forth in the paper filed 11/10/2010 appears to corresponds to that previously made/entered via the amendment filed 8/24/2010.

2) Further, as noted by applicant, the listing of claim #35 in item #2 on the PTOL-37 mailed 10/12/2010, i.e., as being an allowed claim, is clearly erroneous and represents an obvious typographical error as evidenced, for example, by the other papers associated therewith (e.g., the claim index, the issue information, etc). Specifically, item #2 on the PTOL-37 mailed 10/12/2010 should have read: "The allowed claim(s) is/are 18-22, 24-26, 29-31, 33-34, 36, and 37, renumbered 1-15 respectively"

/DAVID E HARVEY/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2481